

On the finding of a second Ribbonfish.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,—Having heard in May last that another Ribbonfish, or *Gymnetrus*, had been found near Whitby, and being in that town on Monday last, I inquired for it in the museum, and I was shown the specimen by an assistant there.

This fish is labelled “Ribbon fish cast up at Whitby, April 23, 1866,” but its specific name is not given. It was cast upon the sands near Whitby, and was discovered by some schoolboys. Being unwieldy, and 10 feet long, they could not convey it with them; so they cleverly cut it into five slices, and then carried the slices separately. A man who stuffs birds near the museum has preserved it very well, and sewn together the five slices. The tail is broken; there are no appendages about the head; and the long dorsal fin is a good deal injured, as well as the numerous rays. From want of time, and the glass case being so close to the back of the fish, I could not wait to count the number of the rays. This specimen may be, like that cast up at Seaton Snook on the 1st or 2nd of last March, the *Gymnetrus Banksii*, which was 14 feet 7 inches in length; though I am inclined to think it is the “king of the herrings,” as one of the species is called.

The distance from Seaton Snook to Whitby Sands is some thirty miles along the Yorkshire coast, to the south-east.

I am, Gentlemen,

Yours truly,

JOHN HOGG.

Norton House, Stockton-on-Tees,
July 6, 1866.

A few words on the Mammoth, in connexion with the Engravings recently found in Périgord and supposed to represent this Animal.* By H. BRANDT.

Professor Brandt, referring to the account given by M. Lartet of a plate of fossil ivory from Périgord bearing incisions which appeared to represent an elephant with a long mane, and to a second note by M. Vibraye on the reproduction in reindeer-horn of a head supposed to be that of the Mammoth, remarks that these discoveries were particularly interesting to him, as he had been for years accumulating materials towards a monograph of the Mammoth. He states that as long as ten years ago, in his memoir on the distribution of the Tiger, he expressed the opinion that *Elephas primigenius*, *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, *Cervus euryceros*, *Bos primigenius*, *Bos urus*, *Bos moschatus*, *Cervus Alces*, *Elaphus*, and *Tarandus*, &c., belonged, with man, to a single contemporary fauna, that in Asia these large animals were pursued by the tiger at the most distant periods, and that the remainder was in part destroyed by man.

* According to a note appended by Milne-Edwards to the title of this paper, the proper spelling of the name of this animal is “Mamont.”

The researches made in France have shown the truth of this opinion; but Professor Brandt makes the following observations on the figures of the Mammoth described by MM. Lartet and Vibraye. The figure on a plate of ivory described by the former evidently represents the anterior half of an elephant; and it is quite clear that, by means of the lines observed on the neck, shoulders, and flank, the artist has tried to indicate long hairs, which might be regarded as representing parts of a mane. The direction of the tusks reminds one vividly of the Mammoth; but it must be remarked, with regard to the mane, that neither the form nor the density of this has yet been sufficiently demonstrated by naturalists. Adams accepted the notion of a mane, without having seen it, from the testimony of his companions and the presence of long hairs; and Tilesius does not oppose this conclusion. But the merchant Boltunoff, who saw the Mammoth three years before the arrival of Adams, and in a much better state of preservation, says nothing about a mane. Nevertheless two pieces of the skin of the nape, still attached to the cranium of the Mammoth at St. Petersburg, show a considerable quantity of the basal portions of rigid hairs, which were evidently rather long, and may at least be taken for traces of the existence of a mane. Perhaps, however, the artist of Périgord had a better opportunity of recognizing the mane than the Russian naturalists.

The representation of an elephant in reindeer's horn, described by M. Vibraye, seems to resemble the Indian elephant, at least as regards the anterior part of the head. The ear is rather close to the eye; it is oblong and comparatively very narrow. All these characters, especially the small size of the ear, remind us of the Mammoth.—*Ann. des Sc. Nat.* sér. 5. tome v. pp. 280–282.

Note on the Discovery of the Dermal Shield in Megatheroid Animals.
By Prof. REINHARDT.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,—I send you for insertion in the 'Annals' an extract from a letter received from Professor Reinhardt, of Copenhagen, and remain

Yours obediently,

British Museum,

A. GÜNTHER.

July 23, 1866.

"May I also draw your attention to the fact that this 'discovery' of a dermal shield in Megatheroid animals was made as much as twenty years ago, and that Lund, in his last work on the extinct Mammalian Fauna of Brazil, expressly states that he found a kind of dermal shield in two different genera, *Scelidotherium* and *Cælodon*, gives a very detailed description of them, and even draws the at that time justifiable and natural conclusion that probably all Megatheroid animals were furnished with a more or less similar shield. The shield was not so perfectly developed in *Scelidotherium* and *Cælodon* as Burmeister has found it to be in *Myiodon*; but that is of small importance (see 'Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Afhandlingar,' Kjöbenhavn, 1846, 12 Deel, p. 77)."

Ann. & Mag. N. Hist. Ser. 3. Vol. xviii.

10